

REMARKS

Claims 93-178 are pending in this application with claims 93, 147 and 175 being independent claims. No new matter has been added. The application as presented is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Double Patenting Rejection

The Office Action states that Claims 93, 147 and 175 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double-patenting over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,714,977. The Office Action also states that a timely filed Terminal Disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.321(c) may be used to overcome this rejection. Applicant filed a Terminal Disclaimer with respect to U.S. Patent No. 6,714,977 in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.321(c) on July 1, 2009. The Office accepted this Terminal Disclaimer on July 29, 2009. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 93, 147 and 175 is respectfully requested.

Provisional Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 93, 147 and 175 also stand provisionally rejected on the grounds of nonstatutory double patenting over claims 93, 98, 103 and 107 of co-pending Application No. 10/775,898. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented. Without acceding to the correctness of this rejection, Applicant defers from filing a Terminal Disclaimer until allowable subject matter is recognized in the either present application or Application No. 10/775,898. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner hold this rejection in abeyance pending recognition of allowable subject matter in the either present application or Application No. 10/775,898.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 93-146 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beheshti et al. (hereinafter Beheshti) U.S. Patent No. 5,955,946 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,139,177 to Venkatraman et al. (hereinafter Venkatraman). Claims 147-178 stand rejected under the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,363,422 to Hunter et al. (hereinafter Hunter). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and requests reconsideration in light of the following comments.

As an initial matter, Applicant respectfully maintains the assertion that the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman is improper as explained in the Response filed September 4, 2009. Simply put, Beheshti teaches tight integration with a centralized reporting system, such as IHP OpenviewTM, which stands in contrast to the decentralized, device-by-device reporting approach disclosed in Venkatraman. Thus, one of ordinary skill would not seek to combine these references as proposed in the Office Action. Consequently, the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman is improper and the proposed combination of Beheshti, Venkatraman and Hunter is improper due to its incorporation of the improper combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman. Neither of these improper combinations may be used as a basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 93-178 is respectfully requested.

Moreover, even if one were to combine the references as proposed, several of the claims pending are allowable over the proposed combinations for additional reasons. For example, claim 99 is allowable over the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman. Claim 99 depends from claim 98 and further recites “wherein the power source is the excess voltage provided by an Ethernet cable coupled to an Ethernet connector.” Page 7 of the Office Action asserts that the additional elements of claim 99 are taught or suggested by column 7, lines 43-50 of Beheshti. Column 7, lines 43-50 of Beheshti recite:

The alarm/facility management unit 10 automatically issues a power failure alarm to warn network operators of a potentially critical power failure situation. In the event of a power failure, the alarm/facility management unit 10 immediately switches to back-up battery which provides full functionality, including alarm notification to the NOC. The alarm/facility management unit 10 remains operational for about twenty minutes after primary power failure. The alarm/facility management unit 10 switches back to the main power supply when it comes back.

The relied upon portion of Beheshti does not teach or suggest the system of claim 98, “wherein the power source is the excess voltage provided by an Ethernet cable coupled to an Ethernet connector” as required by claim 99. Rather the relied upon portion of Beheshti discusses the operation of the alarm/facility management unit 10 when the unit encounters a power failure.

Nothing in Venkatraman cures this infirmity. Therefore, the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman does not render claim 99 obvious. Accordingly, for at least these additional reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 99 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

In another example, claim 103 is allowable over the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman for reasons beyond the impropriety of the proposed combination. Claim 103 depends from claim 93 and recites “further comprising a radio frequency interface operable to communicate with a device external to the network.” Page 8 of the Office Action asserts that the additional elements of claim 103 are taught or suggested by column 10, lines 12-21 of Venkatraman. Column 10, lines 12-21 of Venkatraman recite:

In one embodiment, the device 10 is a printer device wherein the processor 200 and the memory 210 preform image rendering functions and the device-specific hardware 300 includes printer hardware and associated circuitry and wherein the input/output circuitry 220 provides network access to the printer device 10. The loader 24 in this embodiment enables loading of other software objects into the printer including the notifier 26 and enables loading of updates for the native code that performs printer functions. The loader 24 in this embodiment also enables loading of printer manuals and other text based information associated with the printer device. The notifier 26 in this embodiment provides email messages or HTTP post method notification for predetermined events such as new toner cartridge required or paper input bin empty.

The relied upon portion of Venkatraman does not teach or suggest the system of claim 93, “further comprising a radio frequency interface operable to communicate with a device external to the network” as required by claim 103. Rather the relied upon portion of Venkatraman discusses the operation of a printer device connected to the network. Nothing in Beheshti cures this infirmity. Therefore, the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman does not render claim 103 obvious. Accordingly, for at least these additional reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 103 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

In another example, claim 104 is allowable over the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman for reasons beyond the impropriety of the proposed combination. Claim 104 depends from claim 93 and further recites “wherein the microprocessor is an embedded Java microprocessor.” Page 8 of the Office Action asserts that the additional elements of claim 104 are taught or suggested by column 7, lines 8-28 of Beheshti. Column 7, lines 8-28 of Beheshti recite:

The alarm/facility management unit 10 is equipped with a variety of hardware components. Major known electrical components are mounted within the alarm/facility management unit 10. Such components include a printed circuit board mounted in firm support within the alarm/facility management unit 10. The circuit board carries certain coupling and driver electronics with a microprocessor, Flash or Flash-disk memories and random access memories (RAM). In general, the Flash or Flash-disk memories are used to contain instructions and programs while the RAM memories are employed for operating and working data. Of course, movement and process of instructions as well as data is controlled and accomplished by the microprocessor. The microprocessor is connected to all the keys on the front of the alarm/facility management unit and is variously connected to the other elements of the alarm/facility management unit 10. The memories are connected to the microprocessor through several signal paths. The alarm/facility management unit 10 is powered from an alternating current source and includes a back-up battery for providing power when power from the alternating current source is disrupted.

The relied upon portion of Beheshti does not teach or suggest the system of claim 93, “wherein the microprocessor is an embedded Java microprocessor” as required by claim 104. Rather the relied upon portion of Beheshti discloses use of a conventional microprocessor. Nothing in Venkatraman cures this infirmity. Therefore, the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman does not render claim 104 obvious. Accordingly, for at least these additional

reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 104 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

In another example, claim 105 is allowable over the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman for reasons beyond the impropriety of the proposed combination. Claim 105 depends from claim 93 and further recites “wherein the microprocessor is a tiny internet interface microprocessor.” Page 8 of the Office Action asserts that the additional elements of claim 105 are taught or suggested by column 7, lines 8-28 of Beheshti. However, as discussed above, this portion of Beheshti simply discloses use of a conventional microprocessor. Thus, Beheshti does not teach or suggest the system of claim 93, “wherein the microprocessor is a tiny internet interface microprocessor” as required by claim 105. Nothing in Venkatraman cures this infirmity. Therefore, the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman does not render claim 105 obvious. Accordingly, for at least these additional reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 105 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

In another example, claim 106 is allowable over the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman for reasons beyond the impropriety of the proposed combination. Claim 106 depends from claim 93 and further recites “wherein the microprocessor operates with an embedded Java software platform.” Page 8 of the Office Action asserts that the additional elements of claim 106 are taught or suggested by column 7, lines 8-28 of Beheshti. However, as discussed above, this portion of Beheshti simply discloses use of a conventional microprocessor. Thus, Beheshti does not teach or suggest the system of claim 93, “wherein the microprocessor operates with an embedded Java software platform” as required by claim 106. Nothing in Venkatraman cures this infirmity. Therefore, the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman does not render claim 106 obvious. Accordingly, for at least these, the rejection of claim 106 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

In another example, claim 107 is allowable over the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman for reasons beyond the impropriety of the proposed combination. Claim 107 depends from claim 93 and further recites “wherein the sensor comprises an air flow sensor comprising a hot-wire anemometer circuit.” Page 8 of the Office Action asserts that the additional elements of claim 107 are taught or suggested by column 4, lines 29-36 of Beheshti. Column 4, lines 29-36 of Beheshti recite:

The alarm/facility management unit also serves the function of monitoring environmental conditions in remote locations, and reporting that information to an NOC. The alarm/facility management unit includes two environmental sensors for continuously monitoring temperature and relative humidity to determine if conditions are within pre-set thresholds.

The relied upon portion of Beheshti does not teach or suggest the system of claim 93, “wherein the sensor comprises an air flow sensor comprising a hot-wire anemometer circuit” as required by claim 107. Rather the relied upon portion of Beheshti discloses use of temperature and relative humidity sensors but fails to mention an air flow sensor. Nothing in Venkatraman cures this infirmity. Therefore, the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman does not render claim 107 obvious. Accordingly, for at least these, the rejection of claim 107 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

In another example, claim 108 is allowable over the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman for reasons beyond the impropriety of the proposed combination. Claim 108 depends from claim 107 and further recites “wherein air flow is calculated.” Page 8 of the Office Action asserts that the additional elements of claim 108 are taught or suggested by column 7, lines 53-59 of Beheshti. Column 7, lines 53-59 of Beheshti recite:

The alarm/facility management unit 10 also serves the function of monitoring environmental conditions in remote locations, and reporting that information to an NOC. The alarm/facility management unit 10 includes two environmental sensors for continuously monitoring temperature and relative humidity to determine if conditions are within pre-set thresholds.

The relied upon portion of Beheshti does not teach or suggest the system of claim 107, “wherein air flow is calculated” as required by claim 108. Rather the relied upon portion of Beheshti discloses use of temperature and relative humidity sensors but fails to mention an air flow sensor. Nothing in Venkatraman cures this infirmity. Therefore, the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman does not render claim 108 obvious. Accordingly, for at least these additional reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 108 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

In another example, claim 110 is allowable over the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman for reasons beyond the impropriety of the proposed combination. Claim 110 depends from claim 109 and further recites “wherein the system generates a signal upon detecting an audible alarm.” Page 9 of the Office Action asserts that the additional elements of claim 110 are taught or suggested by column 4, lines 12-17 of Beheshti. Column 4, lines 12-17 of Beheshti recite:

The alarm/facility management unit takes a variety of alarm/facility inputs, including alarm/facility contact closures (form C, dry contacts), analog inputs, serial inputs, and converts them to standard SNMP messages which can then be viewed by any SNMP management platform. Users can configure the alarm/facility management unit to monitor up to 128 individual alarm/facility points (IP) with one unit.

The relied upon portion of Beheshti does not teach or suggest the system of claim 109, “wherein the system generates a signal upon detecting an audible alarm” as required by claim 110. Rather the relied upon portion of Beheshti discloses use of contact closures, analog inputs and serial inputs but fails to mention generating a signal upon detecting an audible alarm. Nothing in Venkatraman cures this infirmity. Therefore, the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman does not render claim 110 obvious. Accordingly, for at least these additional reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 110 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

In another example, claim 121 is allowable over the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman for reasons beyond the impropriety of the proposed combination. Claim 121 depends from claim 120 and further recites “wherein the HTML interface comprises an image display area, a monitored parameter display area, an alarm threshold display area, and a system user information display area.” Page 11 of the Office Action asserts that the additional elements of claim 121 are taught or suggested by column 4, lines 62-67 of Venkatraman. Column 4, lines 62-67 of Venkatraman recite:

The web browser 40 includes a display 42 for generating visual objects including text, images, multimedia objects, and graphical user interface objects. The web browser 40 includes a selection

device 44 that enables a user to select objects and URL links rendered on the display 42 and to enter information into forms rendered on the display 42.

The relied upon portion of Venkatraman does not teach or suggest the system of claim 120, “wherein the HTML interface comprises an image display area, a monitored parameter display area, an alarm threshold display area, and a system user information display area” as required by claim 121. Rather the relied upon portion of Venkatraman discusses the types of visual objects that may be displayed in the display 42 by the web browser 40 without reference to the specific arrangement required by claim 121. Nothing in Beheshti cures this infirmity. Therefore, the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman does not render claim 121 obvious. Accordingly, for at least these additional reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 121 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

In another example, claim 122 is allowable over the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman for reasons beyond the impropriety of the proposed combination. Claim 122 depends from claim 121 and further recites “wherein the system user information display area can be configured by a user to display customized information.” Page 11 of the Office Action asserts that the additional elements of claim 122 are taught or suggested by column 4, lines 52-67 of Venkatraman. Column 4, lines 52-67 of Venkatraman recite:

In addition, the device 10 transfers email messages and HTTP post commands via the network 30 during event notification. The email addresses contained in the registered interest log 27 may be targeted for users anywhere on the network 30, including, for example, users of the computer system 52 or the web browser 40. The URLs contained in the registered interest log 27 may be targeted anywhere on the network 30 including, for example, web server tasks and corresponding event handling tasks that execute on the computer system 52.

The web browser 40 includes a display 42 for generating visual objects including text, images, multimedia objects, and graphical user interface objects. The web browser 40 includes a selection device 44 that enables a user to select objects and URL

links rendered on the display 42 and to enter information into forms rendered on the display 42.

The relied upon portion of Venkatraman does not teach or suggest the system of claim 121, "wherein the system user information display area can be configured by a user to display customized information" as required by claim 122. Rather the relied upon portion of Venkatraman discusses the types of visual objects that may be displayed in the display 42 by the web browser 40 or via email without reference to the specific arrangement required by claim 122. Nothing in Beheshti cures this infirmity. Therefore, the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman does not render claim 122 obvious. Accordingly, for at least these additional reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 122 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

In another example, claim 125 is allowable over the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman for reasons beyond the impropriety of the proposed combination. Claim 125 depends from claim 93 and recites "further comprising a video imager to provide a digital image of the space." Page 12 of the Office Action asserts that the additional elements of claim 125 are taught or suggested by column 4, lines 62-67 of Venkatraman. However, as discussed above, this portion of Venkatraman simply discloses the types of visual objects that may be displayed in the display 42 by the web browser 40. Thus, Venkatraman does not teach or suggest the system of claim 93, "further comprising a video imager to provide a digital image of the space" as required by claim 125. Nothing in Beheshti cures this infirmity. Therefore, the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman does not render claim 125 obvious. Accordingly, for at least these additional reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 125 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

In another example, claim 126 is allowable over the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman for reasons beyond the impropriety of the proposed combination. Claim 126 depends from claim 125 and further recites "wherein the video imager is a CMOS imager." Page 12 of the Office Action asserts that the additional elements of claim 126 are taught or suggested by column 4, lines 62-67 of Venkatraman. However, as discussed above, this portion of Venkatraman simply discloses the types of visual objects that may be displayed in the display 42 by the web browser 40. Thus, Venkatraman does not teach or suggest the system of claim 125, "wherein the video imager is a CMOS imager" as required by claim 126. Nothing in Beheshti

cures this infirmity. Therefore, the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman does not render claim 126 obvious. Accordingly, for at least these additional reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 126 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

In another example, claim 127 is allowable over the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman for reasons beyond the impropriety of the proposed combination. Claim 127 depends from claim 126 and recites “further comprising a binary input to activate the video imager to capture an image of the space.” Page 12 of the Office Action asserts that the additional elements of claim 127 are taught or suggested by column 7, lines 53-59 of Beheshti. However, as discussed above, this portion of Beheshti simply discloses use of temperature and relative humidity sensors. Thus, Beheshti does not teach or suggest the system of claim 126, “further comprising a binary input to activate the video imager to capture an image of the space” as required by claim 127. Nothing in Venkatraman cures this infirmity. Therefore, the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman does not render claim 127 obvious. Accordingly, for at least these additional reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 127 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

In another example, claim 128 is allowable over the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman for reasons beyond the impropriety of the proposed combination. Claim 128 depends from claim 127 and recites “further comprising an external sensor, wherein the external sensor provides the binary input upon the occurrence of a preset condition.” Page 12 of the Office Action asserts that the additional elements of claim 128 are taught or suggested by column 4, lines 30-36 of Beheshti. However, as discussed above, column 4, lines 29-36 of Beheshti simply disclose use of temperature and relative humidity sensors. Thus, Beheshti does not teach or suggest the system of claim 127, “further comprising an external sensor, wherein the external sensor provides the binary input upon the occurrence of a preset condition” as required by claim 128. Nothing in Venkatraman cures this infirmity. Therefore, the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman does not render claim 128 obvious. Accordingly, for at least these additional reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 128 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

In another example, claim 129 is allowable over the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman for reasons beyond the impropriety of the proposed combination. Claim 129 depends from claim 128 and further recites “wherein the external sensor is a magnetic switch for

sensing the opening of a door to the space, and wherein the preset condition is the opening of the door.” Page 12 of the Office Action asserts that the additional elements of claim 129 are taught or suggested by column 4, lines 29-36 of Beheshti. However, as discussed above, column 4, lines 29-36 of Beheshti simply disclose use of temperature and relative humidity sensors. Thus, Beheshti does not teach or suggest the system of claim 127, 128, “wherein the external sensor is a magnetic switch for sensing the opening of a door to the space, and wherein the preset condition is the opening of the door” as required by claim 129. Nothing in Venkatraman cures this infirmity. Therefore, the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman does not render claim 129 obvious. Accordingly, for at least these additional reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 129 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

In another example, claim 130 is allowable over the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman for reasons beyond the impropriety of the proposed combination. Claim 130 depends from claim 129 and recites “further comprising a record data file to track personnel access into a room.” Page 12 of the Office Action asserts that the additional elements of claim 130 are taught or suggested by column 4, lines 29-48 of Beheshti. Column 4, lines 29-48 of Beheshti recite:

The alarm/facility management unit also serves the function of monitoring environmental conditions in remote locations, and reporting that information to an NOC. The alarm/facility management unit includes two environmental sensors for continuously monitoring temperature and relative humidity to determine if conditions are within pre-set thresholds. Warning and alarm conditions determined by the user are immediately reported to the NOC. The alarm/facility management unit can monitor high and low warning settings as well as high and low danger settings. The purpose of the warning messages is so that an alarm/facility can be sent to the NOC before the maximum and minimum danger thresholds are reached. In addition to the static environmental, the alarm/facility management unit has the ability to detect the rate of change for any one or both of these environmental measurements. If, for example, the temperature in a remote location rises more

quickly than some predetermined criteria, a warning or danger SNMP trap is immediately sent to the NOC for further investigation or for some corrective action to be taken.

The relied upon portion of Beheshti does not teach or suggest the system of claim 129, “further comprising a record data file to track personnel access into a room” as required by claim 130. Rather the relied upon portion of Beheshti discloses use of temperature and relative humidity sensors to notify a NOC of out of tolerance conditions but fails to disclose any record of personnel access into a room. Nothing in Venkatraman cures this infirmity. Therefore, the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman does not render claim 130 obvious. Accordingly, for at least these additional reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 130 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

In another example, claim 131 is allowable over the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman for reasons beyond the impropriety of the proposed combination. Claim 131 depends from claim 93 and recites “further comprising instructions for software agents operable to investigate an internal condition of a network component, the network component accessible via the at least one port.” Page 13 of the Office Action asserts that the additional elements of claim 131 are taught or suggested by column 3, lines 3-12 of Beheshti. Column 3, lines 3-12 of Beheshti recite:

The alarm/facility management unit includes a housing having a front side and a rear side. The front side includes a liquid crystal display (LCD) for displaying two lines of up to twenty alphanumeric characters. The front side also includes four control keys which enable a user to access a software program contained within the alarm/facility management unit and perform a number of functions through the program. The front side of the alarm/facility management unit also includes a serial port enabling communications with a personal computer.

The relied upon portion of Beheshti does not teach or suggest the system of claim 93, “further comprising instructions for software agents operable to investigate an internal condition of a network component, the network component accessible via the at least one port” as required by claim 131. Rather the relied upon portion of Beheshti discloses a user interface that may be

used to access a software program. Nothing in Venkatraman cures this infirmity. Therefore, the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman does not render claim 131 obvious. Accordingly, for at least these additional reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 131 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

In another example, claim 132 is allowable over the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman for reasons beyond the impropriety of the proposed combination. Claim 132 depends from claim 131 and further recites “wherein the software agents investigate the internal condition of compatible network components through communication in accordance with an interface, the interface being an SNMP, DMI, or SMBIOS interface.” Page 13 of the Office Action asserts that the additional elements of claim 132 are taught or suggested by column 4, lines 12-28 of Beheshti. Column 4, lines 12-28 of Beheshti recite:

The alarm/facility management unit takes a variety of alarm/facility inputs, including alarm/facility contact closures (form C, dry contacts), analog inputs, serial inputs, and converts them to standard SNMP messages which can then be viewed by any SNMP management platform. Users can configure the alarm/facility management unit to monitor up to 128 individual alarm/facility points (IP) with one unit. Alarm/facility input types include serial port cards for inputs from external devices that use serial protocols, analog input cards, and pulse based input cards. The alarm/facility management unit automatically issues a power failure alarm to warn network operators of a potentially critical power failure situation. In the event of a power failure, the alarm/facility management unit immediately switches to back-up battery which provides full functionality, including alarm notification to the NOC. The alarm/facility management unit remains operational for about twenty minutes after primary power failure. The alarm/facility management unit switches back to the main power supply when it comes back.

The relied upon portion of Beheshti does not teach or suggest the system of claim 131, “wherein the software agents investigate the internal condition of compatible network

components through communication in accordance with an interface, the interface being an SNMP, DMI, or SMBIOS interface” as required by claim 132. Rather the relied upon portion of Beheshti discloses that the management unit can receive input and change the input into SNMP messages. Nothing in Venkatraman cures this infirmity. Therefore, the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman does not render claim 132 obvious. Accordingly, for at least these additional reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 132 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

In another example, claim 136 is allowable over the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman for reasons beyond the impropriety of the proposed combination. Claim 136 depends from claim 93 and further recites “wherein the system is mountable on a wall in a position to monitor the contents of a server room.” Pages 13 and 14 of the Office Action assert that the additional elements of claim 136 are taught or suggested by column 10, lines 45-54 of Beheshti. Column 10, lines 45-54 of Beheshti recite:

FIG. 13 shows the IP segment submap 52. This screen allows a user to see all of the devices, in the form of icons, that are connected to their NMS platform. Each unit shows up as a node on the network with its own IP address. FIG. 14 shows a device group submap 54 that is accessed by double clicking on an icon in the IP segment submap. This screen allows a user to view all of the alarms, relays, communication and sensor information for a particular device. The user can also configure the serial ports or initiate a software upgrade from this screen.

The relied upon portion of Beheshti does not teach or suggest the system of claim 93, “wherein the system is mountable on a wall in a position to monitor the contents of a server room” as required by claim 136. Rather the relied upon portion of Beheshti discloses a user interface that may be used to view alarms, relays, communication and sensor information. Nothing in Venkatraman cures this infirmity. Therefore, the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman does not render claim 136 obvious. Accordingly, for at least these additional reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 136 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

In another example, claim 138 is allowable over the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman for reasons beyond the impropriety of the proposed combination. Claim 138 depends from claim 93 and recites “further comprising a unique universal resource locator and static internet protocol address.” Page 14 of the Office Action asserts that the additional elements of claim 138 are taught or suggested by column 4, lines 11-15 of Venkatraman. Column 4, lines 11-15 of Venkatraman recite:

In addition, the web page 18 may contain one or more URLs that specify additional web pages located within the device 10. The web page 18 may also contain one or more URLs that specify additional web pages located external to the device 10.

The relied upon portion of Venkatraman does not teach or suggest the system of claim 93, “further comprising a unique universal resource locator and static internet protocol address” as required by claim 138. Rather the relied upon portion of Venkatraman discusses URL’s located on web page 18 without mentioning IP addresses, in general, or the static IP address required by claim 138. Nothing in Beheshti cures this infirmity. Therefore, the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman does not render claim 138 obvious. Accordingly, for at least these additional reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 138 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

In another example, claim 142 is allowable over the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman for reasons beyond the impropriety of the proposed combination. Claim 142 depends from claim 93 and further recites “wherein the relative humidity sensor comprises a ceramic plate that shrinks or expands with changes in relative humidity.” Page 14 of the Office Action asserts that the additional elements of claim 142 are taught or suggested by column 7, lines 53-59 of Beheshti. However, as discussed above, this portion of Beheshti simply discloses use of temperature and relative humidity sensors and does not discuss the elements that comprise the sensors. Thus, Beheshti does not teach or suggest the system of claim 93, “wherein the relative humidity sensor comprises a ceramic plate that shrinks or expands with changes in relative humidity” as required by claim 142. Nothing in Venkatraman cures this infirmity. Therefore, the proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman does not render claim 142 obvious. Accordingly, for at least these additional reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 142 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Page 17 of the Office Action states the following:

Regarding claims 148-174, the limitations disclosed in these claims have already been rejected (see claims 94-146). Same rational used to rejected claims 94-146 equally applies to claims 148-174.

The additional elements presented in each of dependent claims 154, 155, 157, 165, 166, 169, 170, 171 and 172 corresponds, respectively, to the additional elements presented in each of dependent claims 103, 107, 110, 121, 122, 128, 129, 131 and 132. Consequently, each of claims 154, 155, 157, 165, 166, 169, 170, 171 and 172 is allowable for the same additional reasons as those articulated for each of dependent claims 103, 107, 110, 121, 122, 128, 129, 131 and 132, respectively. Accordingly, for at least these additional reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 154, 155, 157, 165, 166, 169, 170, 171 and 172 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration is respectfully requested. This application should now be in condition for allowance; a notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an accompanying payment, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50/2762, Ref. A2000-720020.

Respectfully submitted,

John J. Fowler et al. Applicant

By: /Thomas J. McGinnis/
Thomas J. McGinnis, Reg. No. 58,026
Thomas M. Sullivan, Reg. No. 39,392
LANDO & ANASTASI, LLP
One Main Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142
Telephone: 617-395-7000
Facsimile: 617-395-7070